

REMARKS

Claims 1-8 are pending in this application, of which claims 1 and 5 are independent. In this Amendment, claims 1 and 5 have been amended. Care has been exercised to avoid the introduction of new matter. Support for the amendments to the claims can be found in, for example, paragraphs [0018] and [0038] of the specification, and Fig. 5.

Patentability under 35 U.S.C. § 102

The rejection of claims 5, 6, and 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Edgar (U.S. Patent No. 5,469,275) is respectfully traversed. Applicants submit that Edgar does not identically disclose a display device including all the limitation recited in independent claim 5. Specifically, the reference does not disclose, among other things, that “when a gamma adjustment is performed, said display device stops displaying the video image and displays a gamma-corrected still image, the tile display pattern, and the gamma adjustment menu simultaneously on a screen, and when the gamma adjustment is completed, said display device restarts displaying the video image,” as recited in independent claim 5.

In the Office Action, the Examiner asserted that Fig. 9 of Edgar shows the claimed tile display pattern and gamma adjustment menu. Even if the Examiner’s position is assumed proper, Edgar does not disclose that when a gamma adjustment is performed, the display device stops displaying the video image and displays the gamma-corrected still image, the tile display pattern, and the gamma adjustment menu simultaneously on a screen. The reference does not also describe that when the gamma adjustment is completed, the display device restarts displaying the video image.

Based on the foregoing, Edgar does not identically disclose a display device that satisfies all the limitation recited in independent claim 5. Hence, Edgar does not anticipate independent claim 5. Dependent claims 6 and 8 are also patentably distinguishable over Edgar at least because these claims respectively include all the limitations as recited in independent claim 5. Applicants, therefore, respectfully solicit withdrawal of the rejection of the claims and favorable reconsideration thereof.

Patentability under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The rejection of claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Edgar is respectfully traversed.

Claim 7 depends on independent claim 5. Applicants thus incorporate herein the arguments made in response to the rejection of claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as evidenced by Edgar. The Examiner's additional comments do not cure the deficiencies of Edgar. Applicants, therefore, respectfully solicit withdrawal of the rejection of the claim and favorable reconsideration thereof.

The rejection of claims 1-4 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Edgar in view of Sachs (U.S. Patent No. 6,992,796) is respectfully traversed. Applicants submit that Edgar and Sachs, individually or in combination, do not disclose or suggest a display device including all the limitations as recited in independent claim 1. The applied combination of the reference does not teach, among other things, "when a gamma adjustment is performed, said display means stops displaying the video image and displays a gamma-corrected still image, the adjustment pattern signal, and the gamma correction value simultaneously on a screen, and when

the gamma adjustment is completed, said display means restarts displaying the video image,” as recited in claim 1.

In the statement of the rejection, the Examiner, referring to column 9, lines 43-59 and Fig. 9 of Edgar, asserted that the reference teaches “said adjustment pattern signal, said gamma correction value and said gamma-corrected still image are displayed on the same screen,” as recited in claim 1 in the May 13, 2011 Amendment.

Fig. 9 and the Col. 9, lines 43-59 of Edgar, however, merely teach a technique for a “user to specify changes to points on each of the color grayscale splines.” The color grayscale splines shown in Fig. 9 is “a visual readout of each of the points on the grayscale that may be displayed over a portion of the image or may be displayed in a separate part of the display such as in a separate window” (column 9, lines 45-48).

Accordingly, it is apparent that Edgar does not teach, among other things, that “when a gamma adjustment is performed, said display means stops displaying the video image and displays a gamma-corrected still image, the adjustment pattern signal, and the gamma correction value simultaneously on a screen.” Edgar does not also teach that “when the gamma adjustment is completed, said display means restarts displaying the video image.”

Although Sachs describes color calibration of display devices, the reference is silent on the above-discussed limitations of claim 1 and cannot cure the deficiencies of Edgar.

Based on the foregoing, Edgar and Sachs, individually or in combination, do not disclose or suggest a display device including all the limitations as recited in independent claim 1. Dependent claims 2-4 are also patentably distinguishable over Edgar and Sachs at least because these claims respectively include all the limitations as recited in independent claim 1. Applicants,

therefore, respectfully solicit withdrawal of the rejection of the claims and favorable reconsideration thereof.

Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that this application should be allowed and the case passed to issue. If there are any questions regarding this Amendment or the application in general, a telephone call to the undersigned would be appreciated to expedite the prosecution of the application.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 500417 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP



Tomoki Tanida
Registration No. 60,453

600 13th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005-3096
Phone: 202.756.8000 KEG:TT:amz
Facsimile: 202.756.8087
Date: September 19, 2011

**Please recognize our Customer No. 20277
as our correspondence address.**